



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,140	03/12/2004	Chris E. DiFrancesco	54673-297873	2231
23342	7590	02/22/2008		
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1001 WEST FOURTH STREET WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27101			EXAMINER DUONG, THANH P	
			ART UNIT 1797	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/801,140

Applicant(s)

DIFRANCESCO ET AL.

Examiner

TOM P. DUONG

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 78-82 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/13/05

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-77) in the reply filed on December 4, 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 631 805 (hereinafter EP '805) in view of Machida et al. (5,494,881) and Dettling et al. (4,335,023). EP '805 discloses a honeycomb carrier comprising inorganic oxide (titanium oxide) in amount of at least 50% by weight and at least one catalytically active component on the carrier of 1.0-30% by weight (page 3, lines 39-45); and a wall thickness of less than 0.22mm (page 3, lines 35-38); and a compressive strength of at least 1.5 kg/cm² (Table 3).

EP '805 essentially discloses the honeycomb with the same structural body of the instant claims but is silent with respect to the hydraulic diameter and macroporosity.

However, Dettling et al. teaches a honeycomb body with a high percentage of inorganic oxide (alumina) and a catalytically active component (Col. 7, lines 30-36) and the porosity of such structure is within the range of 0.001 to 0.01 m²/g with diameter ranging from 2000-20000 Angstrom. Such configuration provides a high degree of accessible catalyst surface to increase the catalytic activity (Col. 1, lines 44-Col. 2, line 21).

Machida et al. also discloses a ceramic honeycomb body containing inorganic oxide having characteristics of a thin wall structure, high compressive strength, high cell density, low heat capacity, and high degree of OFA (open frontal area) and a catalytically active component (Col. 1-Col. 4). Machida discloses the same structural honeycomb body as the instant claim and further discloses that one of ordinary skill in the art, thru routine optimization, can control and obtain these mechanical properties thru a series of optimized formulae (1) and (2) (Col. 2, lines 45-49).

Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Dettling and Machida et al. to one having ordinary skill in the art to fabricate the ceramic honeycomb structural body of EP '805 with a high degree of porosity as taught by Dettling et al. to increase the catalytic activity performance and obtaining the desirable mechanical properties for the honeycomb body thru a series of optimized formulae as taught by Machida.

With respect to the defect level, the applied references above disclose the honeycomb structural body of the instant claim; thus, the structure of honeycomb catalyst body has minimum defect level.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-77 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/801,140. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application essentially claims substantially the same subject matter as the instant application but is silent with respect to the defect level. However, the copending application discloses all structural features of the instant application and further discloses similar mechanical properties as the instant application and thus, it would appear obvious that the copending application provide a honeycomb structure with a small defect level.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOM P. DUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM (IFP).

Art Unit: 1797

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tom P Duong/
Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/Glenn A Caldarola/
Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797